

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed August 9, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 21, 23, 48, 50, 54 and 56 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-20, 22, 24-47, 49, 51-53 and 55 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

New claims 57-59 also particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. No new matter has been added.

With this amendment it is respectfully submitted the claims satisfy the statutory requirements.

The First 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-7, 13-19, 21-24, 27-34, 40-46, 48-52 and 54-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Lynch¹ in view of Paseman², among which claims 1, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 43, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55 and 56 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

¹ U.S. Patent No. 6,002,854

² U.S. Patent No. 5,745,765

According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.),

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure.³

Specifically, the Office Action contends that, as to claims 21, 48, and 54, the elements of the presently claimed invention are disclosed in Lynch except that Lynch does not teach "indicating the connection is not valid if the connection is listed in a compatibility issues table and no resolution code is listed which can be executed"⁴ The Office Action further contends that Paseman teaches "indicating the connection is not valid if the connection is listed in a compatibility issues table and no resolution code is listed which can be executed" and that it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Paseman into Lynch. The Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons set forth below.

The present invention employs a comprehensive method to validate connections based on a multi-tiered algorithm. This method also incorporates "real world" override mechanisms by including pre-defined connection rules and connection compatibility issues. These compatibility issues include support for resolution codes that allow for automatic configuration changes at the connection endpoints in addition to basic connection blocking.

³ M.P.E.P. § 2143.

⁴ Office Action pages 5-6.

Lynch describes connections as part of the configuration process and the use of basic constraints such as DataType. Lynch, however, does not teach a method for validating complex multi-port, multi-equipment connections nor does it teach any override mechanisms.

Specifically, Lynch fails to teach or suggest "indicating the connection is valid if a fixed connection rule is available for the connection of said ports of said pieces of equipment." In fact, none of the prior art cited in the office action describes the use of fixed or pre-defined connection rules.

Furthermore, Lynch fails to teach or suggest "comparing port detail, payload, protocol, signal types, and cabling requirements in the model for said ports of said pieces of equipment." Lynch only describes the DataType being examined. DataType reflects a description of the data's format or structure (e.g., SCSI). Payload, however, refers to the top-level information, and is specifically differentiated from protocol, which is defined as the encoding of the information. *See Specification, paragraph [0065]*. Lynch does not teach or suggest comparing this top level information.

Additionally, neither Lynch nor Paseman teaches or suggests "indicating the connection is not valid if the connection is listed in a compatibility issues table and no resolution code is listed which can be executed." This describes the override mechanism of compatibility issues and resolution codes. Compatibility codes are pre-defined connections that may or may not be valid on the resolution code. The Office Action cites Paseman, column 6, lines 14-42 as allegedly teaching this aspect, however, that section of Paseman only describes incompatibility options

within a configuration property, not pre-defined connections that may or may not be valid based on a resolution code.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21, 48, and 54 are in condition for allowance.

As to claims 23, 50, and 56, the Office Action alleges the elements of the presently claimed invention are disclosed in Lynch except that Lynch does not teach "displaying all cable choices to a user for selection if more than one cable is still available"⁵ The Office Action further contends that Paseman teaches "displaying choices to a user for selection" and that it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Paseman into Lynch. The Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons set forth below.

Lynch describes the need for basic cables but it does not teach the complex "real-world" cable selection and refinement of the present invention. The cable selection logic in Lynch, column 22, lines 22-33 teaches a testing for cables based on connector types and cable length (shortest, longest). As such, Lynch does not teach or suggest "isolating all cables within a minimum and maximum value of a composite cabling specification."

⁵ Office Action page 7.

Additionally, Lynch does not teach or suggest the "cable type" described in the element "isolating all cables of a common cable type specified at each port of the pieces of equipment". There does not appear to be any isolation of cables by cable type in Lynch at all.

Furthermore, Lynch does not teach or suggest "determining if a preferred cable manufacturer is specified" or "isolating all cables made by the preferred cable manufacturer if one is specified." There does not appear to be any determination of anything based on preferred cable manufacturer anywhere in Lynch.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23, 50, and 56 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP



Marc S. Hanish
Reg. No. 42,626

Dated: 1/9/06

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040

Amendments to the Drawings:

Formal Drawings are being filed herewith in compliance with requirements of the Office
Action dated August 9, 2005.